



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,131	01/29/2004	Walter Jones	04116-P0001B	4367
24126 7590 11/10/2009 ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC 986 BEDFORD STREET STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619				
EXAMINER				
CHEN, JOSE V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3637				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/10/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,131

Applicant(s)

JONES, WALTER

Examiner

José V. Chen

Art Unit

3637

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9, 10 and 13-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9-10, 13-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 10/01/09, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The rejection inadvertently did not include the rejection of claims 15-19, 24-28, 31 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103 over Bergsbaken et al in view of Ruben **and Hairston et al**. Hairston et al addresses the skirt limitation included in claims 15-19, 24-28, 31 and was used in a previous rejection, such claims were grouped in error with the claims rejected over Bergsbaken et al and Ruben. To make the record clear, the following rejections are made. Any inconvenience is greatly regretted. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Lanna Mai/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3637

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4-6, 9-10, 13, 14, 20-23, 29, 30, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergsbaken et al in view of Ruben. The patent to Bergsbaken et al teaches structure substantially as claimed including a cover(10), made of a non woven material (columns 3, lines 63-67, column 4, lines 1-13, The use of nonwovens, films, polyesters would have included the use of vinyls), folds and side drops, connection structure including adhesives, bonding (column 4, lines 46-55) the only difference being that the connection structure is a separate piece of material. However, the patent to Ruben teaches the use of providing a folded cover with attaching structure as a unitary one piece member. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify the structure of Bergsbaken et al to include a cover of a

unitary construction, as taught by Ruben since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed. The methods would have been obvious in view of the structures. It is noted that Bergsbaken et al teaches the use of permanent joining through conventional structures including taping, sewing, gluing, heat seaming, ultra-sonic bonding. It is repeated that with respect to the amendments to the claims, it is unclear how the expression "where the free edges of the plurality of side drops and the plurality of pre-fitted corners together define a generally polygonal contour having a shape and dimension substantially identical to a shape and dimensions of the generally polygonal contour of the top cover" define structure other than that of the references used and therefore the preceding rejections are again made. Applicant discusses the shape and dimensions causing the film to be fitted about the sides of a tabletop to hold the cover. It is suggested that the applicant better define the "holding structure". With respect to this comment, it appears that the shape and material somewhat define the "holding structure".

Claims 15-19, 24-28, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergsbaken et al in view of Ruben as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Hairston et al. The patent to Bergsbaken et al in view of Ruben teaches structure substantially as claimed as discussed above including a table cover, the only difference being that a skirt is not attached to the cover. However, the patent to Hairston et al teaches the use of providing a skirt on a cover to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify the structure of Bergsbaken et al in view of Ruben to include a skirt, as taught by Hairston et al since such structure is used in the same intended purpose and would have been a predictable result, thereby providing structure as claimed. It is repeated the use of attaching structures that are again well known and commercially available, such as, adhesives, stitching, heat sensitive adhesives, would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3637

José V. Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3637

/José V. Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637